

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 17, 2011, has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the above amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-25 are pending in this application.

No new matter has been entered.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103:

Claims 11, 14-16, 18-23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0195866, to *Thukral*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0124253, to *Eyer et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0083444, to *Blasko et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0229893, to *Sgaraglino*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078441, to *Drake et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0120498, to *Gordon et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010626, to *Agmoni*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087980, to *Eldering et al.*

Claims 12, 13, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thukral*, in view of *Eyer et al.*, in view of *Blasko et al.*, in view of *Sgaraglino*, in view of *Drake et al.*, in view of *Gordon et al.*, in view of *Agmoni*, in view of *Eldering et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0016972, to *Ogawa et al.*

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thukral*, in view of *Eyer et al.*, in view of *Blasko et al.*, in view of *Sgaraglino*, in view of *Drake et al.*, in view of *Gordon et al.*, in view of *Agmoni*, in view of *Eldering et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent

No. 7,243,362, to *Swix et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,698,020, to *Zigmond et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0188402) to *deAndrade et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0154475, to *Rodriguez et al.*

Before going into the detailed analysis of the differences between the claims made by the applicants vs. the systems and/or combination of systems disclosed by Thukral (US Patent Publication No. 2006/0195866) in view of Eyer et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0124253) in view of Blasko et al. (US Patent No. 2003/0229893) in view of Drake (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0078441) in view of Gordon et al. (US Patent Publication No. Publication No. 2002/0083444) in view of Sgaraglino (US Patent Publication 2002/0120498) in view of Agmoni (US Patent Publication No. 2002/001 0626) in view of Eldering et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0087980) in view of Swix et 01. (US Patent No. 7,243,362) in view of Zigmond et al. (US Patent No. 6,698,020) in view of de Andrade et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2005/0188402) in view of Rodriguez et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0154475), it should be noted that the disclosed Ad Center and Intelligent Control Module (ICM)'s composition, constructs, input and output, target user, and usage patterns and the disclosed methods for determining personalized and localized advertisement are significantly and uniquely different from the prior art as cited in the Office Action. Furthermore, it would be not obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conceive of a system and method for personalized and localized TV ad delivery as disclosed in the claims by combining of the components that are significantly difference from the components, constructs, composition, or usage model of the claimed systems, from the teaching of the 12 systems cited in the Office Action as prior art.

To better illustrate the differences to the systems cited in the Office Action for the uniqueness and non-obviousness of the claimed system and method, the responses to the Office Action below try to follow the sequences of the cited systems referenced in the Office Action to the specific claims. It focuses on illustrating the specific differences between the cited systems and the specific claims for the unique and non-obvious features as disclosed by the applicants. The applicants would respectfully request reconsideration of the above claims in light of the differences and non-obviousness to the prior art stated in the following response.

Regarding the first rejection of claims 11, 14-16, 18-23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thukral (US Patent Publication No. 2006/0195866) in view of Eyer et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0124253) in view of Blasko et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0083444) in view of Sgaraglino (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0229893) in view of Drake (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0078441) in view of Gordon et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0120498) in view of Agmoni (US Patent Publication No. 200210010626) in view of Eldering et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0087980), the applicants would first like to highlight the significant differences between the claims and the cited systems as referenced in the Office Action. Detailed analysis and illustration of the differences are further described in the subsequent paragraphs.

First to summarize the differences between the cited systems to claims 11, 14-16, 18-23, and 25, the composition and constructs of the Ad Center and the service provider being set up independently from of the Ad Center disclosed by the applicants are significantly different from the systems disclosed by Thukral in view of Eyer et al. and further in view of Eldering et al. The execution mode and the target users of the ad and ad agent analysis by the decision support unit in ICM and Ad Center (see Claim 11) are uniquely different from the analyzing ad agencies and advertisers disclosed by Blasko. The usage model, target and mechanisms for ad search and follow-up requests disclosed by the applicants are very different from the ad follow-up disclosed by Sgaraglino. The execution mode, location, and composition of personalized and localized ad schedule generated by the decision unit disclosed by the applicant are also significantly different from the schedule generated by the ad insertion controller disclosed by Gordon. The data usage of the location attribution disclosed by the applicant is very different from the location attributes disclosed by Agmoni. The composition of the independent setup of an Ad Center disclosed by the applicants is significant different from the ad management system and the external ad insertion module disclosed by Eldering et al.

Regarding claim 11 and 14, said Ad Center is independent from the service or content providers with one interface to each service provider. This is uniquely different from the combination of the systems disclosed by Thukral in view of Eyer et al. The difference between the said Ad Center vs. Thukral is that Thukral's system does not have an independent ad-center and it connects to the adviser directly (see Fig. 1). The difference between the said Ad Center vs.

Eyer et al. is that the Ad Center disclosed by Eyer et al is part of the service provider (see Fig. 2), with the television service provider creating customized and directed advertising to that user (see paragraph 0008).

The difference is significant and is part of the uniqueness of the claims since it is this independent Ad Center with the claimed detailed components (see claim 12), which enables the delivery of personalized and localized TV ad. This is non-obvious over the systems disclosed by Thukral and Eyer et al. since a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not conceive of an independent ad center outside of an advertiser or a television service provider. This was an "out-of-the-box" thinking and a paradigm shift since an Ad Center for television advertisement was usually with an advertiser or television service provider at the time of invention.

Aside from an independent Ad Center, the 6 components of the Ad Center (see claim 12) are also uniquely different from the ad server disclosed by Eyer et al. (see fig. 2) because the ad server disclosed by Eyer et al. has only one ad database with some ad target information (see paragraph 0015). In addition, the said Ad Center (see claim 12) also does not store ad target information as compared with the ad server disclosed by Eyer et al. (see paragraph 0015). The ad target Information of the claimed system by the applicant is determined by the Intelligent Control Module (ICM) as part of the ad schedules (see claim 17) for proper ad display by the ad control unit to display the proper advertisement (see claim 17). The decision making unit inside the said Ad Center does not determine the target information or which ad to present to target viewers, whereas the target information disclosed by Eyer et al. (see paragraph 0015) determines the ad target. Furthermore, the multi-directional communications link disclosed by Eyer et al. is for downloading the user's local profiles (see paragraph 0017), whereas the claimed multi-directional communications link claimed between the ad center and ICM (see claim 11) is also for distribution of ad sets and/or ad schedules (see claim 12). Therefore, it is not obvious for a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Thukral with the teaching of the ad server of Eyer et al. to produce the said ad center as claimed, since the disclosed Ad Center has 6 unique components and it does not determine an ad's target viewers or target information.

In summary, regarding claims 11 and 14, the teaching and combination of the systems disclosed by Thukral and Eyer et al. would yield an ad or ad center as a dependent or embedded part of a service provider with multi-directional communications links with set-top boxes (see Eyer et al. paragraph 0017). The ad center would have a media or ad database with user profile data (see Eyer et al. paragraph 0015) for programming and ad content. The multi-directional communications link is for downloading the user's local profiles (see paragraph 0017). However, it is non-obvious and very unique for the claimed Ad Center (see claim 11 and 14) to be independent from the service provider and having 6 components (see claim 12). Additionally, the Ad Center does not determine ad's target viewer or target information and has an ad output decision making unit configured to perform data processing and decision making based on ad attributes and user attributes associated with each ICM;

Regarding the analyzing ad agencies and advertisers disclosed in claims 11, 17, and 18 vs. the ones disclosed by Blasko (see paragraphs 0016, 0028-0031, 0039, 0044, 0051) that Thukral in view of Eye et al. does not disclose, the claimed analysis or decision support unit in ICM (see Claim 17) and decision making unit In Ad Center (see Claim 12) are uniquely different from the ones disclosed by Blasko (see paragraphs 0016,0028-0031,0039,0044,0051).

Firstly, the execution mode of the disclosed decision support and decision making capabilities is uniquely different from the ad agency and advertiser analysis components disclosed by Blasko et al. The decision support and decision making capabilities disclosed by the applicants (see, claims 12 and 18) executes in the background in real-time and without user interactions, whereas the ad agency and advertiser analysis components disclosed by Blasko et al. are for interactive analysis by the advertisers (see paragraphs 0016,0028-0031,0039,0044,0051) and need to be executed by the advertisers.

Secondly, target user of the two disclosed analysis tools is different. The one disclosed in the present patent application is used for determining personalized and localized ads to be inserted into the ad schedule inside an ICM (see claim 23), whereas the one disclosed by Blasko is used by human advertiser interactively for advertising opportunities with the network (see paragraph 0016). The difference is very important because direct user interactions with the analysis component as disclosed by Blasko et al. cannot yield a practical personalized and localized TV advertising to individual viewers, which at the peak may need to support millions

of viewers and tens of millions of ads in a given day. Only with a noninteractive ad analysis, such as the claimed decisions support units inside ICM or Ad Center, it is practical and pragmatic to support millions of users personalized and localized ad needs. These unique differences are also non-obvious and very difficult for a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to conceive of by the teaching of the system of Blasko et al.

Regarding claims 19, 20, 21, and 22 and the system and method disclosed by Sgaraglino for user ad search and follow-up requests and wherein users can follow-up and search for additional ad information that Thukral view of Eyer et al. in view of Blasko et al. does not disclose, there are several unique differences between the ad follow-up and search components disclosed by Sgaraglino (see, Fig. 5 and paragraphs 0018-0019,0046,0094,0100, and 0104) and the ad search and follow-up components disclosed by the applicants with the ICM (see, Claim 11) and 3 paths disclosed in the present patent application (see, claims 19,20,21, and 22). Firstly, the ad search and follow-up mechanisms disclosed by Sgaraglino are for Internet advertising (see, paragraph 0005) and interactive advertising (see, paragraph 0003). Internet advertising is usually delivered via a web browser. Interactive advertising over Internet is usually via user click interactions with a web browser (see paragraphs 0005, 0035), with web specific technologies like cookies (see paragraph 0046) and pop-up browser window and browser buttons (see paragraph 0094). In contrast, the ad search and follow-up mechanisms disclosed by the applicants are for TV ad delivery (see claim 1) and the user interactions is via ICM (see, Claim 11). There were significant differences at the time of invention between Interactions via an Intelligence Control Module (ICM) to TV ad content disclosed by the applicants vs. interactions via a web browser to Internet ad content disclosed by Sgaraglino.

Secondly, the detailed ad search and follow-up mechanisms disclosed by the applicants (see claims 19, 20, 21, and 22) are significantly and uniquely different from the ad search and follow-up mechanisms disclosed by Sgaraglino (see, fig. 5 and paragraphs 0018-0019,0046, 0094,0100, and 0104). Sgaraglino disclosed an advertising response system with a single "click" (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 0018), user input responsive program (see Fig. 5 and paragraphs 0019 and 0046), and ad search or follow-up delivery via email, post mail (see paragraph 0094), or reloading of the new interface or page (see paragraph 0104). In contrast, the ad search and follow-up disclosed by the applicants (see claims see claims 19, 20,21, and 22) is first to search

against an ad repository In the ICM (see claim 19); second to search against the ad repository in the Ad Center (see claim 20), which searches more ad Information in the Ad Center ad repository and can also perform a matching search over the Internet (see claim 21); and third to send the ad follow-up or search request via the ICM over the Internet port (see claim 22). There are no similarities comparing claims 19 and 20 with the mechanisms disclosed by Sgaraglino that are based on web browser clicks (see paragraphs 0018 and 0035) that are for Internet advising (see paragraph 0005), reloading of new interface or page (see paragraph 0104), and follow-up with emails or post mail (see paragraph 0094). Comparing claims 21 and 22 to the Internet ad search via direct user clicks mechanism disclosed by Sgaroglino (see paragraph 0035-0036,0050,0055-0058, and 0082), aside from the TV Ad content vs. Internet advertising usage model Sgaraglino targeted at the time of invention, the additional ad follow-up mechanism disclosed In claim 21 are not directly invoked by user. It is a background process for additional searches at the Ad Center end triggered by user request via the ICM (see claims 18 and 19).

Therefore, it would be non-obvious and very difficult to a person at the time of Invention with ordinary skills in the art to conceive of the ad search and follow-up as disclosed by the applicants (see claims 11, 19, 20, 21, and 22) by the teaching of the system and method disclosed by Sgaraglino.

Regarding the ad insertion controller disclosed by Gordon (see paragraph 0023) for determining the schedule for ad insertion that Thukral in view of Eyer et al. in view of Blasko In view of Sgaraglino in view of Drake does not disclose, there are also significant differences between the ad insertion controller disclosed by Gordon and the personalized and localized ad schedules pertaining to channels and time disclosed by the applicants.

Besides the location attributes not disclosed by Gordon, the ad insertion controller disclosed by Gordon is coupled with ad insertion servers (see paragraph 0023). The ad insertion servers insert respective selected set of advertisements into the background video (see paragraph 0022). The ad insertion controller and ad insertion servers are within the head-end (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 0022) and is a server centric system (see paragraph 0001), with terminals connected to the In-Band and Out-of-Band Delivery Systems that are connected to Session Manager, Transport Stream Generator, and then to Ad Insertion Server (see Fig. 1).

In contrast, the personalized and localized ad schedules generated by the ad decision support unit within the ICM (see claim 17) are not within the "head-end" and integrated with a terminal such as a TV, a TV set-top box, or a computer (see claim 15). Unlike the ad Insertion servers and ad insertion controller disclosed by Gordon (see paragraph 0023), the ad schedules generated by the ad decision support unit are not pre-inserted into any system. They are checked by the ICM control unit in real-time upon detection of commercial times to pick the ads from the ad repository for personalized and localized ad delivery via the input/output unit (see Claim 17). Additionally, due to the integrated ICM and terminal setup disclosed by the applicants (see Claim 17), the ad schedule can be re-generated per event changes such as user preference changes with ICM user preference setup unit or ad changes in ICM ad repository (see Claims 17 and 23). The difference in "head-end" ad insertion controller and the disconnected setup between the terminal and ad insertion controller disclosed by Gordon (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 0023) is also significant for producing targeted and individualized advertisement to viewers. Therefore, it would be nonobvious and very difficult to one at the time of invention with ordinary skills in the art to conceive of the personalized and localized ad schedules pertaining to channels and time (see claims 17 and 23) by the teaching of Gordon.

Regarding the location attributes disclosed by Agmoni that Thukral in view of Eyer in view of Blasko In view of Sgaraglino in view of Drake in view of Gordon does not disclose, there is also significant difference to the location attributes used by localized ad schedule disclosed by the applicants. The location attributes disclosed by Agmoni (paragraph 0017-0019) is for dial access numbers, which is limited to telephone area code. In contrast, the location attributes disclosed by the applicant are a rich set of user localization Information and demographics, which are localized to user's needs including but are not limited to demographic data, household information, location properties, street blocks, local stores, and etc. (see claim 13 and paragraphs 0005, 0016, 0017). Therefore, it would be non-obvious to one at time of invention with ordinary skills in art to conceive of the location attribution used for localized ad schedules by teaching Agmoni.

Regarding the independent Ad Management System disclosed by Eldering et al. referenced in the Office Action that Thukral in view of Eyer in view of Blasko in view of Sgaraglino in view of Drake in view of Gordon in view of Agmoni does not disclose, there is

also significant difference between the Ad Center disclosed by the applicants vs. the Ad Management System (AMS) disclosed by Eldering et al. Firstly, the AMS disclosed by Eldering et al. is not an ad center as described and disclosed by the applicant because the AMS does not have an ad repository for storing ads (see 1), which is a key component of an Ad Center as claimed by the applicants (see Claim 12). Secondly, the external or independent setup disclosed by Eldering et al. is the Ad Insertion Module (see paragraph 0026), which can be external to the AMS (see paragraph 0026). In contrast, the independent setup of the Ad Center as disclosed by the applicants is not an Ad Insertion Module as disclosed by Eldering et al., which is not even part of the Ad Center claimed by the applicants. The independent setup of the Ad Center is the entire Ad Center and the components disclosed by the applicants (see claim 12). Therefore, It would be non-obvious to a person at the time of Invention with ordinary skills in the art to conceive of an independent Ad Center as disclosed by the applicants by the teaching of the AMS and the external Ad Insertion Module by Eldering et al.

Regarding claim 25 and comparing the event triggering mechanism disclosed in claim 25 with Thukral (see Paragraphs 0021,0024,0029-0031,0041) in view of Eyer in view of Blasko in view of Sgaraglino in view of Drake in view of Gordon in view of Agmoni in view of Eldering, the event trigger mechanism is significantly different from what Thukral discloses. The system disclosed by Thukral is an exemplary television-based system with in-band and out-of-band communication links with client devices (see paragraph 0021), which are connected in real-time with the content-provider that receives advertising content from an advertiser and delivers advertising to one or more of the client devices (see paragraph 0022, 0029). Targeted advertising disclosed by Thukral can be delivered via detection of a state change of a client device (see paragraph 0029), with state change defined as power on/off state and channel tuning configuration of the client device (see paragraph 0024). In contrast, the event triggering mechanism disclosed by the applicants is not within the content provider as disclosed by Thukral, it is part of the Ad Center and Intelligent Control Module (see claim 25). Additionally, the stage change event that triggers or drives the change to the personalized and localized ad sets and ad schedules (see claim 25) has nothing to do with power on/off and channel tuning configuration state changed as disclosed by Thukral (see paragraph 0024). It is related to at least one of the addition, change, and removal of an ad, user information, or user attributes.

The advertising report and measurement (see paragraph 30), recording of how many client devices that receive the advertising content and display a targeted advertising (see paragraph 31), and the network types and examples (see paragraph 41) disclosed by Thukral are irrelevant to the event based trigger mechanism disclosed in claim 25.

Therefore, it would be non-obvious to a person at the time of invention with ordinary skills in the art to conceive of an personalized and localized TV Ad delivery system with an event-driven mechanism for personalized ad set and ad scheduled disclosed by the applicants by the teaching of Thukral (see Paragraphs 0021, 0024, 0029-0031, 0041) in view of Eyer in view of Blasko in view of Sgaraglino in view of Drake in view of Gordon in view of Agmoni in view of Eldering.

Regarding the second rejection of claims 12, 13, 24 under 35 U.S.C, 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thukral (US Patent Publication No. 2006/0195866) in view of Eyer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0124253) in view of Blasko et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0083444) in view of Sgaraglino (US Patent Publication No. 200310229893) in view of Drake (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0078441) in view of Gordon et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0120498) in view of Agmoni (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0010626) in view of Eldering et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0087980) and further in view of Ogawa et al. (U.S. 2002/0016972), there are significant differences between the claims and the cited systems of the prior art referenced in the Office Action.

Comparing claim 12 with the system disclosed by Ogawa et al., the applicants would like to point out the following significant differences. Firstly, the BPS (Broadband Printing Service) hosts the receiving unit disclosed by Ogawa et al. (see Fig. 4 content collector 48 and paragraph 0066) configured to interface with content server and ad server (see Fig. 1) is for realizing a printing service by causing a printing apparatus connected to a STB of each home to print information (see paragraph 0002). The information distribution system disclosed by et al. is described with a BPS for performing main control for collecting information from the Internet for obtaining print images (see paragraph 0049) and rasterizing advertisement and content information into rasterized images for printing via the cable network hub to a printer connected to a STB (see paragraphs 0054,0055). In contrast, the Ad Center disclosed by the applicants is not a printing service and connected directly with an ICM (see claim 12).

Secondly, the repository units disclosed by Ogawa et al. (see Fig. 4 Database 203 &6) for storing ad, content, ad attributes, content attributes, and user profile (see paragraphs 0066,0067,0096,0102) is for information distribution via a distribution image generator as a print image (see paragraph 0068) and distributed via a cable network to STB (see Fig. 1). Additionally, the user profile DB disclosed by Ogawa et al. is outside of the BPS (see Fig. 1). In contrast, the repository unit disclosed by the applicants is configured to store advertiser information, ad agency information, ad information, and user information, which is used for ad output decision making unit and personalized and localized ad schedules as stated further in claim 12. User profile information is also part of the Ad Center. Thirdly, the distribution manager disclosed by Ogawa et al. (see Fig. 4 Distribution Manager 60) obtains distribution time information designated by a user in advance from a user profile DB (see paragraph 0069) and manages the flow of content transmission to the BPS Server, ad data insertion, rasterizing the print image, and printing (see Fig. 5 and paragraphs 0072,0073). This is very different from the ad output decision unit disclosed by the applicants, which, instead of being designated by a user in advance and manages the end-to-end content transmission to printing process, performs data processing and decision making based on ad attributes and user attributes associated with each (CM (see Claim 12).

Furthermore, the application server disclosed by Ogawa et al. (see Fig. 4. Application Server 57) is part of BPS (see Fig. 4) and interfaces directly with a cable head-end and cable network (see Fig. 1, Cable Head End 8 and Cable Network 9), which interfaces directly with STB (see Fig. 1, STB 11a, 11b, 11c). In contrast, the Ad Center and Ad input/out unit disclosed by the applicants connects directly with the ICM (see Claim 12) and this is a significant difference. Additionally, status information disclosed by Ogawa et al. (see paragraph 0065) is of a printer, it does not contain information communicated between the Ad Center and ICM that includes user requests, user viewing patterns, and/or ad preferences disclosed by the applicants (see Claim 12).

Therefore, regarding claim 12, it would be non-obvious to a person at the time of invention with ordinary skills in the art to conceive of a personalized and localized TV Ad delivery system with an Ad Center configuration as disclosed by the applicants by the teaching

of Ogawa et al., which is for rasterizing content and ad information into a print image and distribute it to a user's printer connected with a STB via the cable network.

Regarding claim 13 and its uniqueness and non-obviousness, please see analysis regarding the uniqueness of claim 12.

Regarding claim 14 and comparing it with the distribution manager and the determination processing of destination users disclosed by Ogawa et al. (see Fig. 5 and paragraphs 0071-0073), there are significant differences between the decision support units claimed by the applicants inside an ICM and the Ad Center (see Claim 14). The decision support unit disclosed by the applicants is for determining personalized and localized ad schedules either in ICM or Ad Center (see Claims 23 and 25) and ICM targeted ad set at the Ad Center end (see Claim 24). In contrast, the distribution manager disclosed by Ogawa et al. is not for decision support by the ICM or Ad Center to generate targeted ad schedule or ad set. It obtains distribution time information designated by a user in advance from a user profile DB (see paragraph 0069) and manages the flow of content transmission to the BPS Server, ad data Insertion, rasterizing the print Image, to printing (see Fig. 5 and paragraphs 0072, 0073). These are two totally different subjects and not obvious for a person at the time of invention with ordinary skills in the art to conceive of a personalized and localized TV Ad delivery system with a decision support unit for ICM and Ad Center as disclosed by the applicants by the teaching of Ogawa et al., which is for rasterizing content and ad information into a print image and managing the distribution of the print image to a user's printer connected with a STB via the cable network.

Regarding the third rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thukral (US Patent Publication No. 2006/0195866) in view of Eyer et al. (US Patent publication No. 2002/0124253) in view of Blasko et al. (US Patent No. 2003/0229893) in view of Drake (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0078441) in view of Gordon et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0083444) in view of Sgaraglino (US Patent Publication 2002/0120498) in view of Agmoni (US Patent Publication No. 2002/001 0626) in view of Eldering et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0087980) and further in view of Swix et al. (US Patent No. 7,243,362) in view of Zigmond et al. (US Patent No. 6,698,020) in view of de Andrade et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2005/0188402) in view of Rodriguez et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0154475), in addition to the unique and significant differences discussed in the previous

paragraphs between the rest of the claims and the systems or combination of systems disclosed by Thukral in view of Eyer et al. in view of Blasko et al. in view of Drake in view of Gordon et al. in view of Sgaragline in view of Agmoni in view of Eldering et al., it should be noted there are significant differences to the systems or combination of systems disclosed by Swix et al. in view of Zigmond et al. in view of de Andrade et al. in view of Rodriguez et al.

Regarding the decision support unit disclosed by Swix, the processor disclosed by Swix (see Fig. 3, processor 301c; col4, lines 24-26; col. 5, lines 1-16) has several differences to the said ICM ad decision support unit (see claims 17, and 19-25).

Firstly, the decision support unit of claim 17 outputs ad schedules pertaining to channels and time, whereas the processor disclosed by Swix Is used for data collection (See Fig. 4, step 410; col 4, lines 24-26, col. 5, lines 3-5), the Ad Insertion Device (see 3, 301d), and to insert ad content to the broadcast content (See Fig. 4, step 422). The difference is significant and important because the said decision support unit performs data collection for the user information unit (see claim 17), which also have data collection from ad preference setup (see claim 17). Additionally and more importantly, the output ad schedule is independent of the ad Insertion process disclosed by Swix (See Fig. 4). Ad schedule generation can be event triggered (see claim 17) or preprogrammed. The significance of separating personalized and localized ad schedule generation from ad insert greatly reduces the potential performance and execution risks in reduction to practice, because the data collection and decision making process can be performance intensive. If the decision making and data collection processes are part of the ad insertion process as disclosed by Swix (see Fig. 4), it may potentially cause performance issues for real time ad Insertion since there can potentially be millions of users and user attributes, thousands of applicable ad content, and hundreds of localization attributes for the decision support unit to act on. The separation of ad schedule generation from ad insertion can significantly improve ad insertion performance which Is executed by the ad control unit of the ICM (see claim 17) since the ad control unit inside the ICM just need to perform a simple look-up of the ad schedule, while the ad schedule can be generated Independent of the said ad insertion process and more effectively leverage ICM computing power.

Secondly, said decision support unit in claim 17 also Interacts and make decision based on user preference setup and can be triggered based on events like ad, user information insertion, change, or deletion (see claim 25), which are not disclosed by Swix.

Thirdly, the said decision support unit also determines personalized and localized ads based on a variety of methods as described in claims 19 through 25, which Includes ad follow-up and search inside ICM (claim 19), inside ad center (claim 20), via internet through ad center (claim 21) or ICM directly (claim 22). The methods also includes event-based triggering of the decision support mechanism within ICM or Ad Center (claims 23 and 24), and keeping synchronization between the ICM and Ad Center the data required for the decision support (claim 25). These methods are integral components to each other and the collective use of these methods form a flexible and robust ad decision support and follow-up processes for users interacting with the ICM. In contrast, the methods disclosed by Swix only focuses only on a step by step ad insertion process with no mentioning of the said methods in claims 19 through 25.

These 3 unique and significant differences are very non-obvious for a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to conceive of a personalized and localized TV Ad delivery system with the decision support mechanism disclosed In claim 17 by the by the teaching of the processor and Ad Insertion Device disclosed by Swix et 01.

Comparing the event triggering mechanism disclosed the applicants and the one disclosed by Zigmond, there are also significant differences. The event triggering mechanism disclosed by Zigmond is triggered based on event like signal carried in the video programming feed, or based on an external mechanism such as information contained in an electronic program guide for display of video programming feed (see col. 4, lines 36 -35). In contrast, the event triggering mechanism in claim 17 is based on deletion, addition or change event on ad, user information or attributes (See claim 25) for determination if the decision support engine needs to be re-run to keep the ad schedule information up to date. The difference is very important because the events and event triggering mechanism disclosed by Zigmond are not applicable or irrelevant to ad schedule generation pertaining to a user's channels or time.

Therefore, it is non-obvious for a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of Invention to conceive of a personalized and localized TV Ad delivery system with an event triggering mechanism (see Claims 17 and 25) by the teaching of Zigmond.

Regarding the expert business rules and mathematical and statistic models established on user and ad attributes information disclosed In the claim 17 vs. the ones disclosed by Andrade, there are also significant differences.

Firstly, business rules, mathematical and static models are complex subjects that have many algorithms, tens and thousands of research papers, and requires extensive research for the proper business rules mechanism and models to be applied. Just like the stochastic model in statistics or mathematics, which is used differently by different financial institutions, with people having Ph.D. degrees in math or statistics applying the model different based on different financial factors. In math or statistics, there are hundreds, if not thousands, of models or theories just like stochastic model. Each model may have hundreds or thousands of business uses.

Secondly, take business rules for example; business rules mechanisms are part of Artificial Intelligence (AI) subject that can be supported with expert systems, neural networks, fuzzy logic, genetic algorithms, constraint-based systems and many other AI mechanisms. Each mechanism in business rules already has thousands of PhD or Master research paper on them, let alone the over tens of millions of business rules systems implemented as IT (Information Technology) systems across million of companies In the world, because each company has their own business rules. Reference to business rules, mathematical model and statistical models In the said ICM (claim 17) is to state that the ICM will leverage existing technologies in business rules, mathematical and static models, which may have tens of millions of option or variations to be considered or implemented in reduction to practice, with the said system is not locking down on one or two business rules mechanism.

Thirdly, business rules and mathematical models are implemented by every company in the world since every company has its own business rules or mathematical models. There is always uniqueness among tens of millions of companies in implementing their own business rules. Stating Implementing business rules by company A and B does not mean company A and B are implementing the same thing.

Lastly, The disclosed business rules by Zigmond (see paragraphs 0055 -0120), which has a mix of business rules represented in XML, schema definitions in XSD [see paragraph 0053], business requirements, system components, and etc., is very unique to Zigmond's business

context and there may be millions of variations or differences to the business rule and system disclosed by Zigmond.

Regarding ad follow-up and ad search unit disclosed by Sgaraglino, please see the differences discussed for claims 19, 20, and 22.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the claims set forth in the Office Action of August 17, 2011, be withdrawn, that pending claims 11-25 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course. It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments, without specific authorization, to the undersigned's deposit account, No. 50-5335.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 16, 2011

By: /EHK/
Edwin H. Keusey
Registration No. 34,361

Mailing Address:
KEUSEY & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
420 Jericho Turnpike, Suite 324
Jericho, NY 11753
Tel: (516) 934-0951
Fax: (516) 934-0952